



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/915,160	07/25/2001	Toshiharu Yanagida	09792909-5171	7228

7590

05/30/2003

Christopher P. Rauch
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL
Sears Tower, Wacker Drive Station
P.O. Box #061080
Chicago, IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER

IM, JUNGHWA M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2811

DATE MAILED: 05/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/915,160

Applicant(s)

YANAGIDA, TOSHIHARU

Examiner

Junghwa M. Im

Art Unit

2811

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 March 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5,6 and 25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5,6 and 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 5-6 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito et al. (US.6,333,206), hereafter Ito, in view of Nishikawa et al. (US 5,878,943), hereafter Nishikawa, and Milewski et al.(US 6,330,967), hereafter Milewski.

Regarding claims 1-2 and 5-6, Ito shows in Fig.28, a semiconductor apparatus comprising: metal bumps(2) of two different materials formed to connect to a circuit pattern(1) of a semiconductor device and a resin film(10) formed on a circuit pattern forming surface of said semiconductor device so as to seal spaces between the metal bumps and be lower in height than a height of the metal bumps.

Ito shows a substantially identical structure to a device of the pending claim except the metal bumps made of two different materials and the metal bumps being cleaned. Starting in column 5, lines 29, Ito shows a variety of materials for solder balls, and Figure 5A of Milewski shows in detail solder bumps are made of two different material, a high melting ball 35, and a eutectic solder layer 39. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the metal bumps of Ito with the teaching of Milewski in order to improve the connection between a package and a supporting substrate. And Nishikawa teaches in Fig.18 the surfaces of the metal bumps being cleaned (col.12, lines 18-25) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Nishikawa et al. to the device of Ito et al. in order to enhance the strength of the soldered junction through having a clean surface of metal bumps.

Regarding claim 2, Nishikawa et al. teach the surfaces of the metal bumps being cleaned of components causing a rise of a connection resistance and a drop in a joint strength at least connection interfaces. Nishikawa et al. teach, throughout the specification, cleaning method of oxide/contamination coating on the surface of metal bumps to enhance better alignment between the soldering joint.

Regarding claim 25, Fig.28 of Ito shows a semiconductor apparatus comprising: a semiconductor chip 3 inherently having a circuit pattern; a plurality of solder bumps 2 on the semiconductor chip connect to the circuit pattern, the solder bumps forming spaces; a resin film 10 disposed on the semiconductor chip and said solder bumps, said resin film being disposed in the spaces between solder bumps such that upper surfaces of said solder bumps protrude from said resin layer; and a mounting board 1.

Regarding the limitations of a eutectic solder layer disposed on the solder bumps, and cleaning of the upper surfaces of solder balls have been discussed above in claim 1 with the teachings of Milewski and Nishikawa.

Ito does not teach a precoated land with a solder layer, however, Fig. 4 of Milewski teaches a eutectic coated lands 51 (col. 2, lines 65-68) aligned with the solder bumps (Fig. 5A) on the mounting board 21. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Milewski in to the device of Ito and Nishikawa in order to have precoated lands with eutectic layer on a mounting board since precoated lands enhances the

attachment of chips to a mounting board.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims the pending claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Junghwa M. Im whose telephone number is (703) 305-3998. The examiner can normally be reached on **MON.-FRI. 8:30AM-5:00PM**.

Art Unit: 2811

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Thomas can be reached on (703) 308-2772. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

jmi
May 19, 2003


Sara Crane
Primary Examiner